

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 13-26, 30-36 are pending as of the action mailed on November 14, 2006.

Claims 1, 14, 17, 18, 31 and 34 are independent. Claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 25, 31, 35 and 36 have been amended. Claims 2 and 19 are being canceled. No new claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amended claims may be found in the applicant's specification on page 2, lines 15-21; page 3, lines 6-15; page 7, lines 15-17; and page 9, lines 18-20.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiner Hillery for granting an in-person interview on February 21, 2007. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Hans Troesch and Arrienne Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. Recommendations were made by the examiner for overcoming the prior art, which recommendations have been incorporated into the claims as noted above. Specifically, and according to the examiner's suggestion, the applicant has amended the claim language to more clearly define the different types of views.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,256 ("Wu").

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the different types of views. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 1 should be allowed. Amended claim 18 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 14

Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly define the different types of views. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 14 should be allowed. Amended claim 31 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17

Claim 17 is allowable for at least those reasons set forth in the applicant's response dated February 14, 2007. Claim 34 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 17 and is allowable for at least those same reasons.

Remaining Claims

Independent claims 17 and 34 have not been amended further, and are believed to be allowable. The dependent claims which depend from or correspond to the independent claims are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicants' arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Atul K. Puri et al.
Serial No. : 10/619,740
Filed : July 14, 2003
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-594001 / P547

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney
Docket No. 07844-594001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5 April 2007

/Arrienne M. Lezak/
Arrienne M. Lezak
Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 21876
Telephone: (650)-839-5070
Facsimile: (650)-839-5071